



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	British Journal of Economics, Management & Trade
Manuscript Number:	Ms_BJEMT_27738
Title of the Manuscript:	THE IMPACT OF ENTREPRENEURSHIP GROWTH IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF NIGERIAN ECONOMY
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	Overall I do not think that this article contains enough robust data to evidence the statement made on page 8, lines 216; page 9, line 231. I do not think that the correlation between entrepreneurship growth and economic advancement is a "perception issue" we can find out from what the interviewers think about. The authors could strengthen the paper by analyzing time series data for an X period of time of entrepreneurship growth and economic development in Nigeria. The paper would be significantly improved with the addition of more details about data analysis. I advise you to insert the tables produced from the statistical program to support the values presented in lines 247-251, 262-263, or I would suggest you to insert an appendix with the econometric tests and tables generated from the statistical program you use.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The paper is generally acceptable for publication. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article. The conclusions are accurate and supported by the content. However, there is insufficient discussion of exactly how the data are analyzed and how they are supported.	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Erjona Deshati
Department, University & Country	Department of Economic Sciences, Albanian University, Albania